### DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 769 RE 005 842

AUTHOR Donovan, Carl C.

TITLE Feport on the First Year's Experience with Tuition

and Fee Waivers [Washington State].

INSTITUTION Washington State Council on Higher Education,

Olympia.

PUB DATE Jun 73 NOTE 25p.

EDPS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE

DESCRIPTORS Colleges: \*Educational Finance: \*Fees: \*Higher

Education; \*Lower Class Students; Program Descriptions: \*Tuition: Tuition Grants

IDENTIFIERS \*Washington

### ABSTRACT

The state of Washington provides, under law, for each public 4-year institution and the community college system to waive tuition and fees for needy and disadvantaged students. The law further specifies that the dollar amount of fee waivers may equal 3 percent of total resident registration fees, including the equivalent resident portion of nonresident fees that would have been collected if no waivers had been granted. This report is a compilation and evaluation of the information collected on the waiver program for the academic year 1971-72 and a portion of the 1972-73 academic year. It examines the following three characteristics of the waiver program:

(1) the college level general waiver program, (2) the high school completion waiver program, and (3) the distribution of college level and high school completion waivers by recipient classification.

(MJM)



ED 095767

US DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
DOCUMENT HAS BEEN MEDRO
ED ENACY, A MUNICIPED FROM
PERSON OR OR HAN ZATUM NEW A
LOT OF NATURE OF A MUNICIPED FROM
LOT OF NATURE OF NATURE OF MUNICIPED FROM
LOT OF NATURE OF NAT

REPORT ON THE PIRST YEAR'S EXPERIENCE WITH TUITION AND IS THE THE



BEST FORT WATABLE

### COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION

1973

Richard P. Wollenberg, Chairman Marion E. Wilson, Vice-Chairman

## CITIZEN MEMBERS

Richard Albrecht Seattle

Mrs. David Ga: 3r Spokane

Waiter B. Williams
Seattle

J. Scott Barron Bellingham

Cariton Lewis
Tacoma

Marion E. Wilson Spokane Goodwin Chase Tacoma

Mrs. Tad Wada Seattle

Richard P. Wollenberg Longview

### EDUCATIONAL MEMBERS

Dr. James E. Brooks, President Central Washington State College

Dr. Melvin Lindbloom, President Green River Community College

Dr. David McKenna, President Seattle Pacific College

Dr. Emerson Shuck, President Eastern Washington State College

Mr. John Mundt, Director
State Board for Community College Education

Or. Charles J. Flora, President Western Washington State College

Dr. Charles J. McCann, President The Evergreen State College

Dr. Charles E. Odegaard, President University of Washington

Dr. Glenn Terrell, President Washington State University

The Very Rev. Richard Twohy, S.J. President, Gonzaga University

### LEGISLATIVE MEMBERS

Senator Gordon Sandison

Senator George W. Scott

## Representative Richard L. Smythe

#### **EXECUTIVE MEMBERS**

Richard Hemstad, Legal Assistant Office of the Governor Wallace G. Miller, Director Office of Program Planning & Fiscal Management

### STAFF

James M. Furman Executive Coordinator

Dr. William Chance, Deputy Coordinator Pianning and Research

E. Anne Winchester, Deputy Coordinator Student Activity Information and Special Studies

Peggy M. Anet Educational Planner Denis J. Curry, Deputy Coordinator Finance and Information Systems

Stephen J. Blair Administrator

Carl C. Donovan Educational Planner



## REPORT ON THE FIRST YEAR'S EXPERIENCE

WITH TUITION AND FEE WAIVERS

June, 1973

**Project Officer:** 

Carl C. Donovan



# REPORT ON THE FIRST YEAR'S EXPERIENCE WITH TUITION AND FEE WAIVERS

Under the provisions of Chapter 279, Laws of 1971, (now RCW 28B.15.530) each public four-year institution and the community college system is permitted to waive tuition and fees for needy and disadvantaged students. The law further specifies that the dollar amount of fee waivers may equal three percent of total resident registration fees, including the equivalent resident portion of nonresident fees, which would have been collected had no waivers been granted. Chapter 275, Laws of 1971 (the 1971-73 appropriation act) also directed that the waivers equal the full three percent authorized. It further instructed the community colleges to grant waivers equaling two percent of collections to college level students and waivers equaling one percent to high school completion students. The waiver program was funded by

The appropriations act further instructs the Council on Higher Education to collect pertinent information relative to the fee waiver program. This report is a compilation and evaluation of the information collected on the waiver program for the academic year 1971-72 and a portion of the 1972-73 academic year. It will examine the following three characteristics of the waiver program.

- 1) The college level general waiver program
- 2) The high school completion waiver program
- 3) The distribution of college level and high school completion waivers by recipient classification



## GENERAL COLLEGE LEVEL WAIVER PROGRAM

The institutions, in compliance with Chapter 275, are to award waivers on the basis of estimated fee collections. Therefore, the following evaluation considers waivers in the light of fees estimated by the institution prior to the awarding of waivers. It also compares estimated to actual collections to ensure that the fee estimates are indicative of realized fee revenue.

Table I presents an overview of waivers granted during the academic year 1971-72 as they relate to estimated fee collections, and the relationship of actual to estimated collections. Table II offers a similar view of Fall, 1972 waivers and collections.

## Four-Year Institutions

Table I shows that 2.74 percent of the mandated 3.0 percent of estimated collections were waived by the four-year institutions. \$970,291 in waivers were granted to 1875 students per quarter for the 1971-72 academic year, while the level of funded waivers not granted amounts to approximately \$87,000. Approximately 180 students per quarter could have been served by the unused waivers based upon estimated collections. A comparison of Table II to Table I shows that the institutions have apparently gained from their 1971-72 experience. The institutions were able to waive 96 percent of the mandated level for Fall, 1972 versus 91 percent for 1971-72.

A closer examination of Tables I and II reveals that in the case of the universities and two of the state colleges, the waiver levels varied considerably in comparison to the three percent target level. Such a pattern





Table I Report on College Level Tuition and Fee Waivers Academic Year 1971-72

COLLECTIONS

WAIVERS

	Total	Average Number of Students	Amount of	Percentage of		Percentage Actual**
	Estimated	<b>Granted Waivers</b>	Waivers	Collections	Actual Fee	of Estimated
Four-Year Institutions	Fees	per Quarter	Granted	Waived	Collections *	Collections
University of Washington	\$ 16,125,470		224 004 4	d i		
Washington State University	201123	N 7	001,001	2 %5 .7	4 15, 126, 425	% %
Control Workington	DCC , 1 CO , 0	- 07	707, 330	2.96	6, 484, 535	<b>80</b> 6
Central Washington State College	3,014,551	195	87,314	2.90	3, 102, 433	106
Eastern Washington State College	2,654,209	171	76,759	2.89	2,592,005	101
The Evergreen State College	510,072	32	14,453	2.83	457,039	92
Western Washington State College	4,014,838	262	116,969	2.93	3,950,897	101
Composite	\$ 33,150,476	1,873	\$ 907, 291	2.74 8	\$ 31,713,334	\$ <b>86</b>
Two-Year Institutions						
e inscination	326 056 \$	œ	\$ 4,482	1.95%	\$ 220.283	186
Grave Harbor		) in		1.71		16
Olympic	557 595		10,961	1.98	535, 165	100
Skapit Valley	423,105	9#	7, 979	1.89	394, 696	96
Everett/Edmonds	1,139,556	112	23, 585	2.07	1,059,491	96
Seattle	1,828,800	187	37, 216	2.03	1,785,840	101
Shoreline	958,650	7.0	18,595	1.94	1,039,516	110
Bellevue	752,550	58	13,747	1.83	752,055	102
Highline	1,057,560	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	21,001	1.99	991,137	96
Green River	789,255	28	13,961	1.77	791,645	103
Fort Steilacoom	487,424	35	8,432	1.75	379,184	180
Centralia/0VTI	502,343	5#	10, 138	2.02	480,944	66
Lower Columbia	414,818	32	7,019	1.68	330,295	18
Clark	561,340	57	11,249	2.00	623,116	114
Wenatchee Valley	357,829	30	7,387	2.06	330,542	95
Yakima Valley	610,002	57	10,009	1.64	267, 434	96
Spokane	1,328,580	108	26,635	2.00	1,307,313	101
Big Bend	154,846	15	3,818	2.47	167,555	111
Columbia Basin	694' 444	34	8, 425	1.90	436,542	101
Walla Walla	282,000	25	2,667	2.01	247,970	06
Whatcom	30,000	#	830	2.77	32,363	
Tacoma	887,752	η9	15,854	1.79		<b>8</b>
Composite	5 14,020,951	1,254	\$ 272,138	1.94 %	5 13, 438, 649	o* 80 60
Composite all institutions	\$ 47,171,427	3,127	\$1,179,429	2.50%	\$ 45,141,983	<b>ે86</b>

-3-

<sup>\*</sup> Exclusive of non-resident differential, laboratory fees, and fees collected from short courses in self-sustaining public or community service courses

ERIC Full Year Provided by ERIC

Table II
Report on College Level Tuition and Fee Waivers Fall, 1972

COLLECTIONS

WAIVERS

	Total Estimated	Number of Students Granted	Amount of Waivers	Percentage of Collections	Actual Fee	Percentage Actual** of Estimated
Four-Year Institutions	r Ges	Walvers		M41 VEO		
University of Washington	\$5,607,900	905	\$172,059	3.078	\$5,901,198	1038
Washington State University	3,992,528	358	102,472	2.57	3,877,828	100
Central Washington State College	1,147,079	212	34,980	3.05	., 026,224	93
Eastern Washington State College	917,925	156	25,740	2.80	942,285	105
The Evergreen State College	328,410	09	9, 900	3.01	324,119	102
Western Washington State College	1,419,000	251	41,415	2.92	1,367,180	66
Composite	\$ 13,412,842	. 939	\$ 386,566	2.88 %	\$ 13,438,834	1038
Community Colleges						
	6	9	100	9	\$ 75 780	100
Peninsula	7 /8,850	<b>0</b> :	*****	e 60 - 0	00.00	, ec
Grays Harbor	113,710	- i	670	0.73 PF	534.371	107
Olympic	170,000	2 r	757.0	2.03	146,403	. <b>.</b> .
Skagit Valley	151,611	50	3,416	2.14	407.373	105
Costile Costile	670, 133	175	11,737	1.75	564, 539	87
Sporeline	394, 694	<b>80</b> 6	446,7	2.01	392,857	102
Bellevie	272,576	26	6,258	2.30	281,860	107
Highline	375,561	700	6, 972	1.86	345,983	76
Green River	284,836	7.4	6,092	2.14	273, 126	66
Fort Steilacoom	165,958	-	3,403	2.05	159, 100	66
Centralia/OVTI	179,405	36	2,378	1.33	172,971	<b>66</b>
Lower Columbia	137, 907	32	2,060	1.49	128, 505	96
Clark	323,400	04	3,390	1.46	217,174	96
Wenatchee Valley	130,930	32	2,656	2.03	100,191	6/
Yakima Valley	224,915	34	2,822	1.25	188,273	980
Spokane	505,000	62	5,109	1.01	508, 428	102
Big Bend	907'99	16	1,328	2.00	54,215	त्र । स्ट
Columbia Basin	179,312	14	1,162	0.65	130, 477	77
Walla Walla	92,877	14	1,095	1.18	83,553	16
Whatcom	20,000	7	476	2.38	23,843	123
Тасота	276,542	55	4,510	1.63	269,874	80
Composite	\$ 5, 124, 467	1, 150	\$ 87.209	1.70 %	\$ 4,799,128	59 <b>6</b>
Co.nposite all institutions	\$18,537,309	3,089	\$473,775	2.56%	\$18,237,962	3012

-4-

<sup>\*</sup> Exclusive of non-resident differential, laboratory fees, and fees collected from short courses in self-sustaining public or community service courses

<sup>\*\*</sup> Actual Collections refers to collections actually received by the institution, plus the dollar amount of waivers granted

would be expected for the first two years of a new program, especially since the program is tied so closely to estimates of a fluctuating fee revenue pattern. It appears that every effort was made by the financial aid officers to award waivers equal to three percent of fees. However, a certain degree of inability to comply was inherent with estimating the number of students who accept waivers but who do not actually enroll and, in the case of the University of Washington, in obtaining timely feedback on the enrollment status of those students granted waivers by the financial aid office. During 1971-72, the University of Washington financial aid office experienced a delay of eight weeks after the start of the quarter in receiving actual enrollment information. This delay is expected to decrease to four or five weeks in 1973-74. If the University of Washington's performance were excluded from table I, the performance of the four-year institutions would average 2.92% for 1971-72.

In viewing the figures presented in Tables I and II for any particular institution, the relationship between actual and estimated collections and the effect of the two figures on the percentage of collections waived should be noted. Estimated fee collections reflect levels anticipated prior to the awarding of waivers. These estimates would often be revised throughout the year to more closely reflect actual fee collections, which would result in revisions of the number of waivers which are available. The effect of this procedure of updating estimates can be seen in the close correlation between estimated and actual collections for both 1971-72 and Fall, 1972. It is expected that with the close of the second year's experience,



most institutions have stabilized their waiver levels to a position more closely complying with the three percent target.

## Community Colleges

General college level waivers in the community college system for 1971-72 range from 1.64 percent of estimated fees at Yakima Valley College to 2.47 percent at Big Bend Community College; equating to a system average of 1.94 percent. \$272,138 was granted in waivers to about 1,250 students per quarter. Approximately \$8,000 in waivers was left unawarded, which is equivalent to 35 students per quarter. 1971-72 performance indicates that between one percent and two percent of the allotted waivers were unexpended, which is well within expected tolerance.

Results for Fall 1972, however, show a considerable decrease in the percentage of estimated collections waived for college level students. The system-wide average dropped from 1.94 percent in 1971-72 to 1.7 percent in Fall, 1972. Unexpended waivers increased from about \$2,600 per quarter in 1971-72 to \$15,000 for Fall quarter, 1972. The Fall, 1972 level is equivalent to 215 unused student waivers. Unlike the procedures adopted for 1971-72, many of the institutions have purposefully limited their waivers for fall term in order to manage their yearly amounts of waivers more efficiently. The very large majority of students receiving waivers fall term continue to enroll winter and spring terms and to also receive waivers those terms, thus tying up available waivers for the entire year. By underawarding for fall term, the institution is ensuring that new waivers are available for needy students



enrolling winter and spring terms who did not receive waivers in the fall term. This policy is contrary to the language of the appropriations act, which directs the institutions to award two percent each term of the academic year, but it is felt by many of the colleges to be a more equitable one in terms of satisfying need.



## HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION WAIVER PROGRAM

Tables III and IV present a tabulation of waivers granted to high school completion students. The community colleges waived \$91,951 for an average of 808 students each quarter in 1971-72, representing .68 percent of total fee collections. This is considerably below the one percent level mandated by the legislature; it represents approximately 425 unused awards per quarter which were available but were not granted. The amount of waivers expressed as a percentage of fee collections did not vary considerably from 1971-72 to Fall, 1972. During that term the institutions waived .72 percent of their estimated collections.

The ability to waive high school completion fees depends upon the district. Wide variation is exhibited among districts in their percentage of collections to estimated fees. Waivers vary from .03 percent of collections at Big Bend Community College to 1.28 percent at Clark Community College. The distribution of the districts in terms of their abilities to award high school waivers is as follows:

Numbers of districts awarding	g 95 percent of authority and above .	5
Numbers of districts awarding	75 to 94 percent of authority	4
Numbers of districts awarding	50 to 74 percent of authority	5
Numbers of districts awarding	25 to 49 percent of authority	3
Numbers of districts awarding	g 0 to 24 percent of authority	5
_		22

The reasons for some institutions awarding very little high school completion waivers are two fold. (1) The waiver program is need based, therefore the student must be able to demonstrate a financial need in order to receive the waiver. Frequently the financial aid officer found that, because



ERIC

Full text Provided by ERIC

Table III
Report on High School Completion
Tuition and Fee Waivers, 1971-72

		Average Number		
	Total	of Students	Amount of	Percentage of
	Estimated	Granted Waivers	Waivers	Collections
	Fees	per Quarter	Granted	Waived
Institution				
Peninsula	\$ 230,325	#	\$ 863	.37
Grays Harbor		827	7,020	.67
Olympic	552, 595	tit	4,656	78.
Skagit Valley	423,105	29	3,514	.83
Everett/Edmonds	1,139,556	55	7, 550	. 65
Seattle	1,828,800	103	17,668	76.
Shoreline	958, 650	ıs	432	50.
Believue	752,550	13	1,435	91.
Highline	1,057,560	=	1,821	.17
Green River	789, 255	34	5, 569	17.
Fort Steilacoom	481,424	19	3,184	99.
Centralia/OVTI	502,343	39	4,912	86.
Lower Columbia	418,818	22	3,718	68.
Clark	561,340	79	7,165	1.28
Wenatchee Valley	357,829	٣	830	.23
Yakima Valley	610,002	116	6, 125	1.00
Spokane	1,328,580	11	12,862	76.
Big Bend	154,846	-	25	.03
Columbia Basin	694,444	29	1,864	. 42
Walla Walla	282,000	25	1,084	.38
Whatcom	30,000	2	253	78
Tacoma	887,752	18	4, 501	. 50
Composite	\$ 14,020,951	808	\$ 91,951	; 99·

. **9**.

ERIC

Arull liest Provided by ERIC

Table IV
Report on High School Completion
Tuition and Fee Waivers, Fall 1972

		Average Number		
	Total	of Students	Amount of	Percentage of
	Estimated	Granted Waivers	Waivers	Collections
	Fees	per Quarter	Granted	Waived
Institution				
Peninsula	\$ 78,850	m	\$ 249	.328
Grays Harbor	113,710	7	308	72.
Olympic	170,000	28	1,453	<b>58.</b>
Skagit Valley	151,611	34	1,469	76.
Everett/Edmonds	400,850	82	4,053	1.01
Seattle	670,133	118	7,303	1.09
Shoreline	394,694	<b>3</b>	121	.03
Bellevue	272,576	07	2,366	.87
Highline	375,561	20	1,660	<b>111</b>
Green River	284, 836	31	1,983	. 70
Fort Steilacoom	165,958	30	1,244	.75
Centralia/0VTI	179,405	175	1,794	1.00
Lower Columbia	137,907	37	2,004	1.45
Clark	232,400	35	1,971	ະ <b>ອ</b> .
Wenatchee Valley	130,930	10	830	.63
Yakima Valley	224,915	130	2,380	1.06
Spokane	505,000	07	1,501	.30
Big Bend	66, 400	0	•	00.
Columbia Basin	179,312	66	1,473	. 82
Walla Walla	92,877	. 59	257	.28
Whatcom	20,000	ıs	238	1.19
Tacoma	276,542	26	2,158	. 78
				ł
Composite	\$5,124,467	983	\$36,817	.727.

of inability to substantiate such need, he could not justify granting waivers to a high school completion student. Such is the case typically at an institu tion whose high school completion students are already employed full time and are enrolled in high school completion courses on simply a part time basis. Those institutions such as Seattle Central Community College, on the other hand, who were able to grant the full amount of available waivers, experienced no difficulty in qualifying their potential high school completion recipients as needy. Need measured in terms of family income shows, in fact, that of those receiving waivers high school students overall were in greater need of waivers than college level students (see table VI). (2) Because of the part-time nature of the community college high school completion student, there is a lack of general awareness on the part of the student of the availability of fee waivers. Conversations with financial aid officers point to the first factor as being the dominant reason for the low level of waivers. The second factor was largely rectified by the advertising campaigns initiated by lost colleged in 1971-72.

Also relevant in an analysis of high school waivers is the lower dollar demand for these waivers. An average of \$40 was awarded to each high school completion student in 1971-72 compared to \$73 for each college level student, resulting from the fact that the high school completion student is typically enrolled on a part-time basis and paying part-time fees. This requires the community colleges to award twice as many individual waivers to high school completion students as to college level students in order to disperse the same dollar amount. Augmenting this part-time factor is a com-



parative overall enrollment level of about 1/15 as many high school students as college level students, yet one third of the waivers are granted to high school students. In order to achieve mandated levels in both the programs, the colleges would have had to grant waivers to 21 percent of the high school completion students versus 1.3 percent of the college level students.

Despite the difficulty experienced by many colleges in awarding high school waivers, there were still five colleges who were able to award at least 95 percent of the targeted level to needy or disadvantaged students. Based upon discussions with financial aid officers, there are indications that capability exists in these five colleges to grant an even higher level of waivers to high school completion students. However, these institutions would be restricted to the one percent level unless waiver capacity was transferred from other institutions who are not able to grant waivers. Such "pooling" has not been practiced in the community college system.



## THE DISTRIBUTION OF WAIVERS BY RECIPIENT CLASSIFICATION

The recipient is analyzed below in terms of his or her year in school, waiver amount compared to academic load, and income level. These indicators are felt to be the most descriptive of waiver recipients. Other descriptors of the types of waiver recipients will be distributed in a forthcoming statistical report prepared from the unit record file of financial aid recipients maintained by the Council on Higher Education. This report will also describe the distribution of other grant and loan funds as well as funds for tuition and fee waivers.

## Distribution by Year in School (Table V)

Of the 11,245 waivers awarded quarterly during 1971-72, 76.0% were given to vocational and academic undergraduate students. Of these, approximately half were awarded at the community colleges, the remainder being distributed by the four-year institutions. High school waivers awarded by the community colleges totalled 20.5% of all waivers, while waivers to graduate and Medical/Dental/Veterinary Medicine students accounted for 3.5%. The distribution of waivers is compared below to the fall term 1972 enrollment distribution. It is apparent that a much greater proportion of high school completion students were served than college level students, and that percentage-wide a lower number of graduate students were served.



ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

Profile of Recipient by Class Level, 1971-72 Table V

Composite

							Four-Year		AII
	N	WSU*	CWSC	EWSC	TESC	WWSC	Composite	SC's	Institutions
Percentage of number of recipients by class level	}	;	1	ł	!		!	60.8	20.5 %
ingh scraol undergraduate	87.3 %	90.2 %	100.0%	97.5	100.0%	100.0%	92.4%	39.2	76.0
graduate	12.2	8.6	0	2.5	0		7.2	!	m. m
med/dent/vet med	7.	1.2	1	1	;		₹.	1	.2
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0 %
Dollar amount of quarterly	>								
waivers per student by class level									
high school	!	;	!	1	1	1	<b>!</b>	240	1
undergraduate	\$165	\$247.50	\$149	\$149	\$149	\$149	<b>!</b>	73	!
graduate	185	277.50	0	169	0	0	;	!	i i
med/dent/vet med	257	381.50	!	1	;	<b>!</b>	;	l t	!

-14-

<sup>\*</sup> Washington State University data is expressed on a semester basis

	Percentage Receiving Waivers	Percentage of* Total Enrollment
High School		
Completion Students	20.5%	5%
Undergraduates	76.0%	87%
Graduate and Medicine/		
Dentistry/Veterinary Medicine	3.5%	. 8%

# Distribution by Waiver Amounts as Compared to Academic Load (Table V)

Average awards by level of student are shown in Table V for each of the four-year colleges and the community college system. In each case, average awards for the four-year institutions equaled the full-time fee levels for those institutions. It is apparent from these waiver levels that all waivers were awarded to students enrolled full-time. This pattern is continued in large part at the community colleges for awards to college level students.

Awards for this sector averaged \$73 per quarter per recipient, compared to a full-time fee level of \$83.

A pronounced difference is noted at the high school completion level, however, where the average award is \$40 compared to a full-time fee of \$83. This is accounted for by the fact that a high school student is typically enrolled part-time or is enrolled in both a high school completion program and a college level program at the same time. Preliminary data indicates that roughly half of the recipients of high school waivers were enrolled part-time



<sup>\*</sup> These are estimated figures since no information is formally collected on the number of high school students enrolled in community colleges.

or received waivers in partial payment of full-time fees.

## Distribution by Income Level (Table VI)

Table VI displays in percentage form the distribution of waivers by family income level. In the case of a dependent student the income level represents that of the parent. For an independent student, income is only that earned by the student or the student's family if married.

Waivers granted by the community college system were given to students with average income levels below \$3000, while the income level of the average recipient attending a four-year institution was from \$3000 to \$5999. The four-year institutions differed considerably among themselves in their awards by family income level. The Evergreen State College awarded waivers to students with average family incomes below \$3000; recipients at Central Washington State College and Western Washington State College, on the other hand, re-ported average family incomes of from \$6000 to \$7499.

An examination of family income levels reveals much about the philosophy of the institution and the granting of tuition and fee waivers. Community college financial aid officers reported that their institutions are unable to award federal grants to a large proportion of their students because of the student's part-time status; therefore the waiver is frequently used to aid the lower income part-time student who is unable to secure a federal grant.

Another significant factor contributing to the large number of waivers at the very low income level is the fact that federal grant programs assume some parental contribution level regardless of whether the student is financially



ERIC Afull tox Provided by ERIC

Table VI Distribution of Waivers by Family Income, 1971-72

Four-Year Institutions

Community Colleges

Percentage of Recipients by Income Category   Lincome Category   Lin								i					
1940   WSU   CWSC   EWSC   TESC   WWSC   Composite in family   Income   Infamily   Income   Infamily   Income   Infamily   Income   Infamily   Income   Infamily   Income   Infamily   Income   Income   Infamily   Income   Infamily   Income   Infamily   Income   Infamily   Income   Income   Infamily   Inf			Perce	entage of R	ecipients t	y Income	e Category			College Le	vel Waivers	High Completi	School on Waivers
38.97 43.27 20.47 58.57 26.47 33.87 2.4 51.07 2.6 61.67  399 31.6 23.6 39.4 40.6 17.1 17.7 29.0 3.9 3.9 30.6 4.3 27.7  5,999 70.5 7 66.8 7 59.87 40.67 75.67 44.17 62.87 3.1 81.67 3.2 89.37  900 8.5 10.0 11.1 18.2 7.3 11.1 9.9 5.5 5.9 6.1 2.4  900 8.5 10.0 7.4 9.1 4.9 20.7 9.1 6.4 3.7 6.2 11.8  900 8.5 10.0 7.4 9.1 4.9 20.7 9.1 6.4 17.6 6.2 17.8  900 6.8 8.0 7.4 9.1 4.9 20.7 9.1 6.4 17.6 6.4 17.6 6.2 17.8  900 9.5 9.5 9.5 9.5 9.5 9.5 9.5 9.5 9.5 9.5	Income Category	<b>*</b>	WSU	CWSC	EWSC	TESC	WWSC		Average no. of people in family	Percent by Income	Average No. in family	Percent by Income	Average No in family
13.6         23.6         39.4         40.6         17.1         17.7         29.0         3.9         30.6         4.3         27.7           15,999         70.5 %         66.8 %         59.8%         40.6%         75.6%         44.1%         62.8%         3.1         81.6%         3.2         69.3%           4999         13.1         13.9         20.8         27.3         9.8         16.7         15.4         5.0         8.2         5.2         69.3%         5.9         5.9         5.5         5.9         6.1         27.4         5.0         8.2         5.9         6.1         27.4         5.9         6.2         5.9         6.1         2.4         5.9         5.9         5.9         5.9         5.9         6.1         2.4         5.9         5.9         6.1         2.4         5.9         5.9         6.1         2.4         5.9         5.9         6.2         1.8         5.9         6.1         1.8         5.9         5.9         6.1         1.8         5.9         5.9         5.9         6.1         5.9         5.9         5.9         5.9         5.9         5.9         5.9         5.9         5.9         5.9         5.9         5.9	Up to \$2,999	38.9%	43.2%	20.4%	! 	<b>58</b> . 57	26.4%	33.8%	2.4	51.0%	2.6	61.67	2.5
55,999         70.5 %         66.8 %         59.8 %         40.6 %         75.6 %         44.1 %         62.8 %         3.1         81.6 %         3.2         69.3 %           499         13.1         13.9         20.8         27.3         9.8         16.7         15.4         5.0         8.2         5.2         5.9           ,900         8.5         10.0         11.1         18.2         7.3         11.1         9.9         5.5         5.9         6.1         2.4           1,999         6.8         8.0         7.4         9.1         4.9         20.7         9.1         6.4         3.7         6.2         1.8           above         1.1         1.3         .9         4.8         2.4         7.4         2.8         6.6         6.2         1.8           above         1.1         1.3         4.8         2.4         7.4         2.8         6.6         6.5         5.9         6.1         3.4           above         1.1         1.3         4.8         2.4         7.4         2.8         6.6         5.9         6.1         6.2         1.8           above         33000         \$33000         \$6000         \$5000	\$3,000 to \$5,999	31.6	23.6	39.4	9.04	17.1	17.7	29.0	6.8	30.6	4.3	7.72	4.7
499         13.1         13.9         20.8         27.3         9.8         16.7         15.4         5.0         8.2         5.2         5.9         5.9           990         8.5         10.0         11.1         18.2         7.3         11.1         9.9         5.5         5.9         6.1         2.4           1,999         6.8         8.0         7.4         9.1         4.9         20.7         9.1         6.4         3.7         6.2         1.8           above         1.1         1.3         .9         4.8         2.4         7.4         2.8         6.6         6.6         5.9         6.1         2.4           above         1.1         1.3         .9         4.8         2.4         7.4         2.8         6.6         6.6         5.9         6.1         1.8           above         1.1         1.3         1.0         0.0         7.4         7.4         2.8         6.6         6.6         5.9         6.2         1.8           above         1.00.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         20.00 <td>Subtotal to \$5,999</td> <td>70.5 %</td> <td>66.8 %</td> <td>,</td> <td>40.6%</td> <td>75.6%</td> <td>44.12</td> <td>62.87</td> <td>3.1</td> <td>81.67</td> <td>3.2</td> <td>89.3%</td> <td>3.2</td>	Subtotal to \$5,999	70.5 %	66.8 %	,	40.6%	75.6%	44.12	62.87	3.1	81.67	3.2	89.3%	3.2
990         8.5         10.0         11.1         18.2         7.3         11.1         9.9         5.5         5.9         6.1         2.4           1,999         6.8         8.0         7.4         9.1         4.9         20.7         9.1         6.4         3.7         6.2         1.8           above         1.1         1.3         .9         4.8         2.4         7.4         2.8         6.6         .6         5.9         .6           100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.07         100.	\$6,000 to \$7,499	13.1	13.9	20.8	27.3	8.6	16.7	15.4	5.0	8.2	5.2	6.3	4.6
1,999 6.8 8.0 7.4 9.1 4.9 20.7 9.1 6.4 3.7 6.2 1.8 above 1.1 1.3 .9 4.8 2.4 7.4 2.8 6.6 .6 5.9 .6 5.9 .6 io. 0.0 7 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07	\$7,500 to \$8,900	<b>89</b> 5.5	10.0	11.1	18.2	7.3	11.1	6.6	5.5	6.3	6.1	2.4	6.3
above 1.1 1.39 4.8 2.4 7.4 2.8 6.66 5.9 .6 .6 .6 .66 .6 .6 .6 .6 .6 .6 .6 .	\$9,000 to \$11,999	•	<b>8</b>	7.4	9.1	6.4	20.7	1.6	4.0	3.7	6.2	7.8	5.1
100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 100.07 10	\$12,000 and above	1.1	1.3	<b>e</b> ;	# 80	2.4	7.4	2.8	9.9	9.	5.9	. ف	5.0
The \$3000 \$3000 \$6000 \$0 to \$6000 \$3000 \$0 to \$7499 \$2999 to \$7499 to \$7499 \$2999 to \$7499 to \$7	Total	100.0 %	100.0 %		100.0%	100.07	100.0%	100.001		100.0%		100.0%	
nber 3.7 4.3 4.6 4.0 3.4 NA 4.0	Median Income Range	\$3000 to \$5999	\$3000 to \$5999	\$3000 to \$5999	\$6000 to \$7499	\$0 to \$2999	Š.	\$3000 to \$5999		\$0 to \$2999	- <del></del>	\$0 to \$2999	•
	Average Number of People in Family	3.7	æ. ≄	9.	4.0	<b>4</b> .8	¥ Z		0. 4		#. E		3.7

of this latter factor, some institutions grant a number or waivers to students who are financially independent of their parents and whose real income is typically at the very low end of the scale. In addition to these two factors many institutions have reported combining all or most of their waivers with other grants in providing a student aid package for the low income student.

Another technique used in awarding grants, and one which is used by Western Washington State College in its distribution of waivers, is to provide grants to those students who are ineligible for other types of aid. Because of the fact that federal grants are not available to students whose income is equal to or in excess of \$9000 per year, and that the State Need Grant program focuses on the very low income student, Western Washington State College has elected to award a larger proportion of its waivers to those students with higher family incomes.

Eastern Washington State College reports that it chose to include all of its waivers as a part of student aid packages which are reliant upon federal grants and are therefore in all cases based upon income earned by the parents. Income figures in table Vi for Eastern Washington State College report parental income in all cases are consequently somewhat higher than for the other institutions.

Income available for attending an institution of higher education is not always reflected by net family income. There are often other factors such as high unavoidable debts and large living expenses which can effectively bar a potential student. A significant indicator of high living expenses is



the number of people in the family. Table VI displays how the number of people in the family increases as the family income increases, thereby holding expenses at a high level and placing a limit on funds available for education.



## **EXPECTATIONS FOR THE FUTURE**

The staff of the Council on Higher Education will continue to monitor the tuition and fee waiver program through the next biennium. Although the per formance for 1971-72 for all but community college general waivers was considerably below mandated levels, we anticipate substantial improvement for 1972-73 which will continue into 1974-75. A number of technical difficulties experienced during the first year of the program; such as unanticipated withdrawals, the failure of a student to enroll, the inability to determine the status of a student after completion of enrollment cycle; should be rectified or at least accounted for in the planning process for the upcoming biennium.

The four-year institutions are funded for the full three percent waiver levels for the 1973-75 biennium based upon an estimated loss of this amount to local fund revenue, while the community colleges were appropriated funds sufficient to cover waivers equal to 2.7 percent of collections. The latter appropriation reflects the relationship between community college waivers and actual fee collections experienced in 1971-72. In addition to this waiver appropriation the community colleges were also granted \$1.4 million to fund the waiving of all high school completion fees for 1973-75 (Senate Bill 73-2854).

It is expected that each four-year institution and the Community College
System will grant waivers in an amount equal to at least the level funded. In
keeping with the statutes, however, the waivers must not be greater than
three percent of registration fee collections, exclusive of fees related to the
nonresident differential which would have been collected had no waivers been



made.

No mandate was included in 1973 legislation detailing the distribution of fee waivers among college level and high school completion students. However, since \$1.4 million was appropriated specifically for waiving the fees of all high school completion students, it is anticipated that the three percent waiver program authorized by RCW 28B.15.530 will be applied toward college level students.

Based upon Fall, 1972 experience as compared to 1971-72, it is expected that the four-year institutions will achieve waiver levels which will not deviate more than .03 percent from the three percent level by 1974-75. It is further expected that the community colleges will waive at least 2.7 percent of estimated fees for 1973-75.

The experience of the colleges in attempting to grant waivers on a continuous basis throughout the year while also serving new students enrolling after the start of fall term has resulted in a pattern of waivers which fluctuates significantly from term to term. If this policy results in total waivers equaling more than three percent in any quarter on a systemwide basis, the provisions of RCW 28B.15, which limit quarterly waivers to three percent, are violated. It is suggested that the statutes be modified to strike reference to quarterly waivers and allow for the granting of waivers totalling three percent of registration fees over the period of one academic year.

In the granting of both general and high school completion waivers the institutions appeared to base waiver levels as closely as possible on actual rather than estimated fees. Some institutions accomplished this by revising



their estimates on the basis of timely information received on actual fee collections. Others, however, lacked actual collection information on a timely basis and some of them underawarded in order not to exceed the three percent maximum. It is emphasized that waivers are not to be granted on the basis of actual collections, and that if the institution does not have the ability to effectively revise their estimates they should not do so. The question of correlation between estimated and actual collections is separate from the issue of the ability of the institution to grant the full amount of authorized waivers. The question of accuracy of fee estimates will remain a valid one but will be continued to be handled distinct from the question of ability to waive.

